				193847
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA				MOMA
(Caption of Case) Certification of the Use of Universal Service Funds			BEFORE THE	
			PUBLIC SERVICE COMM OF SOUTH CAROLII	
	7 C.F.R. §54.314 a	,	or sooth canon	VA.
	cations Act §254(e	CC Docket No. 96-	COVER SHEET	<b>N</b> 2
45		)		
		)	DOCKET	
		)	NUMBER: 1997 - 239	<u>:c                                    </u>
		)		
		)	2	
		<u></u>		<u>m</u> – []
(Please type or print			10 B 35 1 1000	
Submitted by:	Scatt Elliott		SC Bar Number: 1872 ,	<u>='</u> -
Address:	721 Olive Street		Felephone: 803-771-055	
	Columbia, SC 2		Fax: <u>803-771-801</u> Other:	<u> </u>
NOTE: The cover s	heet and information co		mail: selliott@elliottlaw.us or supplements the filing and service	of pleadings or other papers
			mission of South Carolina for the pur	
be filled out comple	_ <del>_</del>			
-		•	MATION (Check all that apply	•
	elief dema <mark>nde</mark> d in p	etition $U$ Request for i	item to be placed on Commission	's Agenda expeditiously
Other:				
INDUSTRY (C	heck one)	NATIII	RE OF ACTION (Check all tha	t anniv)
<u></u>				
☐ Electric		☐ Affidavit	Letter	Request
D Electric/Gas		O Agreement	☐ Memorandum	Request for Certificatio
Electric/Telecommunications		O Answer	Motion	Request for Investigation
O Electric/Water		Appellate Review	Objection Objection	Resale Agreement
Electric/Water/Telecom.		Application	O Petition	Resale Amendment
O Electric/Water/Sewer		O Brief	Petition for Reconsideration	Reservation Letter
O Gas		O Certificate	Petition for Rulemaking	Response
Railroad		O Comments	Petition for Rule to Show Cause	Response to Discovery
O Sewer		O Complaint	Petition to Intervene	Return to Petition
<b>☒</b> Telecommunications		O Consent Order	Petition to Intervene Out of Time	Stipulation
Transportation		Discovery	Prefiled Testimony	O Subpoena
O Water		Exhibit	Promotion	O Tariff
O Water/Sewer		Expedited Consideration	Proposed Order	Other:
Administrative Matter		Interconnection Agreement	Protest	
Other:		Interconnection Amendment	Publisher's Affidavit	
		Late-Filed Exhibit	Report	



# ELLIOTT & ELLIOTT, P.A.

### ATTORNEYS AT LAW

721 OLIVE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29205
selliott@elliottlaw.us

SCOTT ELLIOTT

July 11, 2008

TELEPHONE (803) 771-0555 FACSIMILE (803) 771-8010

SOFTHE SERVICE
SOFTHE STATE OF THE STATE OF

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Charles L.A. Terreni, Esquire Chief Clerk and Administrator PSC 101 Executive Center Drive Columbia, SC 29210

RE:

Intrastate Universal Service

Docket No. 97-239-C

Dear Mr. Terreni:

Enclosed please find the original and ten (10) copies of United Telephone Company of the Carolinas d/b/a Embarq's Reply to Return to Motion to Dismiss and Response to Motion Requesting Review of Additional Issues together with a Certificate of Service in above. By copy of this letter I am serving all parties of record.

Please return a clocked copy of the enclosed pleading and certificate of service with my courier. If you or counsel for the parties have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

ELLIOTT & ELLIOTT, PA

Scott Elliott

SE/jcl

**Enclosures** 

c: Parties of Record w/enc.



# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 1997-239-C

IN RE:	)
Proceeding to Establish Guidelines for an	<b>)</b>
Proceeding to Establish Guidelines for an Intrastate Universal Service Fund	)
	)

UNITED TELEPHONE COMPANY OF THE CAROLINAS D/B/A EMBAR S
REPLY TO RETURN TO MOTION TO DISMISS AND
RESPONSE TO MOTION REQUESTING REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL ISSUES

United Telephone Company of the Carolinas d/b/a Embarq (hereinafter "Embarq") respectfully submits its Reply to the Return to the Motion to Dismiss filed by South Carolina Cable Television Association, CompSouth, tw telecom of south carolina, llc and NuVox Communications (hereinafter "CLECs") on July 3,2008 and its Response to the accompanying Motion Requesting Review of Additional Issues. As set forth below, Embarq supports the Motion to Dismiss filed by the South Carolina Telephone Coalition (hereinafter "SCTC") and objects to the Motion Requesting Review of Additional Issues filed by CLECs.

#### I. Introduction

On June 27, 2007, the Commission issued an Order requiring that the cost studies used in the calculation of the Universal Service Fund be updated. Parties filed briefs and comments in response to that order during July 2007. On May 23, 2008 the Commission issued a Notice of Hearing setting a hearing date and a separate letter setting testimony filing dates. In that Notice, the Commission described the scope of the proceeding as "to

In re: Proceeding to Establish Guidelimess for an Intrastate Universal Service Fund (USF), Order Addressing Cost Studies and Administrative Issues, Order No. 2007-422 in Docket No. 1997-239-C.

update the methodology for performing costs studies for the South Carolina Universal Service Fund." After the Notice of Hearing was issued, a conference call was held in which the parties discussed revising the procedural schedule to allow the submission of comments and reply comments regarding the issues to be addressed in pre-filed testimony and at the hearing. Subsequently, SCTC filed its Motion to Dismiss the proceeding on June 20, 2008. Embarq filed a letter in support of that Motion on June 25, 2008. On July 3, 2008, CLECs filed a Return to the Motion opposing the SCTC's request for dismissal and including a Motion asking the Commission to expand the scope of the proceeding to review additional issues relating to the state USF beyond what the Commission identified in Order No. 2007-422 and the May 23, 2008 Notice of Hearing. Embarq respectfully submits this Reply and Return in Response to the CLECs' filing.

#### II. Argument

1. As SCTC argues in its Motion to Dismiss, there is no need for the Commission to conduct a proceeding at this time to revisit USF cost studies. The Commission's rules, which were upheld in their entirety by the South Carolina Supreme Court, provide a clear point for the filing of updated cost studies before a company can implement more than one-third of its company-specific funding requirement. As SCTC stated in its Motion to Dismiss, this cost study update process is already working as intended. (See, SCTC Motion to Dismiss at par. 7) In addition, distributions from the fund are far below the maximum amount of the fund established by the Commission, so it is clear that companies are not over-recovering from the fund today and that the Commission's rules are sufficient to ensure against any over-recovery. (See, SCTC Motion to Dismiss at par.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See, Notice of Hearing and Pre-file Testimony Letter in Docket No. 1997-239-C issued May 23, 2008. Embarq notes that a Notice suspending the scheduled dates pending Commission action on the SCTC's Motion to Dismiss and the CLECs' Motion to Review Additional Issues was issued July 10, 2008

- 13 and Embarq's June 25, 2008 letter in support of SCTC's Motion) Therefore, there is no need to conduct a separate review of the companies' cost studies and the proceedings scheduled to consider updates of the cost studies should be dismissed.<sup>3</sup>
- 2. Should the Commission deny SCTC's Motion to Dismiss and decide to continue with this proceeding, the CLECs' Motion Requesting Review of Additional Issues should be denied and the proceeding should be limited to the scope set forth in Order No. 2007-422 and the May 23, 2008 Notice of Hearing.
- 3. The CLECs' Return and Motion raise the same arguments the South Carolina Cable Television Association and others have repeatedly raised in opposition to the establishment and implementation of the state USF since this docket was first opened. These arguments have been rejected again and again by the Commission and the courts, most recently by the South Carolina Supreme Court. The Commission should not accede to the CLECs' request to revisit these issues yet again in this proceeding.
- 4. The arguments made by the CLECs in their Motion are based on mistaken facts and the CLECs' apparent misunderstanding of the Commission's USF orders. Contrary to the CLECs' statements, the ILECs comply with the Commission's reporting requirements and the ORS properly fulfills its role as the administrator of the fund. In addition, companies are receiving the appropriate amount of support in accordance with the Commission's orders and rules.
- 5. The genesis of this proceeding was a suggestion by the South Carolina Cable
  Television Association and others that "stale cost information" could be resulting in
  Carriers of Last Resort ("COLRs") recovering too much support from the state Universal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> As stated in its June 25, 2008 letter, Embarq supports the Commission's consideration on an expedited basis of the administrative issues raised by the Office of Regulatory Staff.

Service Fund ("USF").<sup>4</sup> The scope of this proceeding (if any proceeding is determined to be necessary), should be limited to that narrow question.

6. That question should be easy to answer. COLRs are not over-recovering from the fund. In 2007, the total size of the USF could be no more than \$340 million. In 2007, total receipts from the fund were approximately \$54 million. COLRs are receiving less than 16% of the USF support for which they are eligible. In addition, USF support represents nothing more than dollar-for-dollar reductions in intrastate access and other non-basic local service rates to remove implicit subsidies for basic local service.

#### III. Conclusion

The Commission should grant the SCTC's Motion to Dismiss, because the Commission's rules provide ample opportunity to review any company's cost study when appropriate to prevent over-recovery from the state Universal Service Fund. If the Commission denies SCTC's Motion and decides to continue with this proceeding, the Commission should also deny CLECs' Motion to Review Additional Issues. Instead, the Commission should restrict the scope of the proceeding as set forth in Order No. 2007-422 and the May 23, 2008 Notice of Hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Elliott, Esquire Elliott & Elliott, P.A.

721 Olive Street

Columbia, SC 29205

803-771-0555

803-771-8010

selliott@elliottlaw.us

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Submission of South Carolina Cable Television Association, CompSouth, Time Warner Telecom of South Carolina, LLC and Nuvox Communications Incorporated Regarding Which USF Issues Should Be Addressed, filed April 3, 2007, in response to Commission Directive dated March 7, 2007, at page 3.



## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have served one copy of Embarq's Reply to Return to Motion to Dismiss and Response to Motion Requesting Review of Additional Issues, in Docket No. 97-239-C on behalf of United Telephone Company of the Carolinas d/b/a Embarq on all below listed parties to this proceeding by depositing a copy addressed to each in the United States Mail, first-class postage prepaid.

Sonia Daniels, Regulatory Specialist AT&T Communications of the Southern States Southern Region - AT&T External Affairs 1230 Peachtree, 4th Floor Atlanta, GA, 30309 Margaret M. Fox, Esquire McNair Law Firm, P.A. P. O. Box 11390 Columbia, SC 29211

Patrick Turner, Counsel AT&T Companies 1600 Williams Street Suite 5200 Columbia, SC, 29201

John F. Beach, Counsel Ellis, Lawhorne & Sims, P.A. Post Office Box 2285 Columbia, SC, 29202

Anthony Mastando, Senior Manager/Regulatory Attorney ITCDeltaCom Communications 7037 Old Madison Pike, Suite 400 Huntsville, AL, 35806

M. John Bowen Jr., Counsel McNair Law Firm, P.A. Post Office Box 11390 Columbia, SC, 29211

Nanette S. Edwards, Esquire Office of Regulatory Staff Post Office Box 11263 Columbia, SC, 29211

Faye A. Flowers, Counsel Parker Poe Adams & Bernstein, LLP Post Office 1509 Columbia, SC, 29202 2008 JUL 11 PM 4: 12

Steven W. Hamm, Esquire Richardson Plowden Carpenter & Robinson, P.A. P.O. Drawer 7788 Columbia, SC, 29202

Bonnie D. Shealy, Counsel Robinson, McFadden & Moore, P.C. Post Office Box 944 Columbia, SC, 29202

Frank R. Ellerbe III, Counsel Robinson, McFadden & Moore, P.C. Post Office Box 944 Columbia, SC, 29202

Robert E. Tyson Jr., Counsel Sowell Gray Stepp & Laffitte, LLC Post Office Box 11449 Columbia, SC, 29211

Zel Gilbert, Director External Affairs Embarq 1122 Lady Street, Suite 1050 Columbia, SC, 29201

William R.L. Atkinson, Counsel Sprint Nextel Corporation 233 Peachtree Street, N.E. Suite 2200 Atlanta, GA, 30303

Stan J. Bugner State Director/Regulatory & Government Affairs Verizon Telecommunications, Inc. 1301 Gervais Street, Suite 825 Columbia, SC, 29201

Benjamin P. Mustian, Counsel Willoughby & Hoefer, P.A. Post Office Box 8416 Columbia, SC, 29202

John M.S. Hoefer, Counsel Willoughby & Hoefer, P.A. Post Office Box 8416 Columbia, SC, 29202-8416

Ross Allen Buntrock, Counsel Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC 1401 Eye Street, Seventh Floor Washington, DC, 20005

Susan B. Berkowitz, Sr. Mgr./Regulatory Attorney Women's Shelter SC Appleseed Legal Justice Center P.O. Box 7187 Columbia, SC, 29202

John J. Pringle, Jr., Counsel Ellis, Lawhorne & Sims, P.A. Post Office Box 2285 Columbia, SC, 29202

Burnet R Maybank, III, Counsel Nexsen Pruet, LLC Post Office Box 2426 Columbia, SC, 29202

J. Phillips Carver, Counsel AT&T 675 West Peachtree St., N.E. Atlanta, GA 30375

Susan S. Masterton, Counsel Embarq 1313 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, FL 32301

This 11<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2008.

Jackie C. Livingston, Legal Assistant

Elliott & Elliott, PA 721 Olive Street Columbia, SC 29205 803-771-0555